

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

LILLIANA SANCHEZ, et al.,

No. C 14-2622 MMC

Plaintiffs,

**ORDER DENYING WITHOUT
PREJUDICE STIPULATION RE:
MOTION TO WITHDRAW**

v.

CAPITAL CONTRACTORS INC.,

Defendant.

AND RELATED COUNTERCLAIMS AND
THIRD-PARTY COMPLAINT
_____ /

On June 24, 2015, a “Stipulation and [Proposed] Order Re Extension of Time of Pending Deadlines and Counsels’ Motion to Withdraw” was filed by (1) Corey, Luzaich, de Ghetaldi, Nastari & Riddle, LLP, the Law Offices of Parviz Darabi, and Alvarenga Law (collectively, the “Corey Law Firm”), as counsel for third-party defendants Hernandez Janitorial Service, Professional CCS Cleaning Services, and JCR Janitorial, and (2) defendant/third-party plaintiff Capital Contractors, Inc.

The stipulation seeks an order deeming an earlier-filed motion to withdraw to include a request that the Corey Law Firm be permitted to withdraw as counsel for the three third-party defendants referenced above, and an order granting the motion to withdraw as so


1 amended. As the stipulation was not accompanied by a showing that either the stipulation
2 or the motion to withdraw had been served on the three third-party defendants, the Court,
3 by order filed July 2, 2015, directed the Corey Law Firm to serve the stipulation and the
4 motion to withdraw on the clients, and to file proof of such service no later than July 17,
5 2015. By said order, the Court also directed the Corey Law Firm to file, no later than July
6 17, 2015, the last known address and telephone number of each third-party defendant for
7 whom they wished to withdraw as counsel.¹

8 To date, the Corey Law Firm has not filed the requisite proof of service, nor has it
9 provided the last known address and telephone number of any third-party defendant.

10 Accordingly, the above-referenced stipulation is hereby DENIED without prejudice.

11 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

12
13 Dated: August 3, 2015

14 
MAKINE M. CHESNEY
United States District Judge

15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

¹Additionally, the Court pointed out that the stipulation made no reference to a fourth third-party defendant, Hernandez Cleaning Service, which, like the other three such defendants, appeared to be represented by the Corey Law Firm.